

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Currently, claims 55-62 are pending in this application. Claims 55-62 are newly added in this Amendment/Response.

Request to Fully Initial Form PTO-1449:

Applicant filed an Information Disclosure Statement including a Form PTO-1449 on July 7, 2005. However, all of the "OTHER DOCUMENTS" on this Form PTO-1449 have not been initialed. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that these "OTHER DOCUMENTS" be initialed as indication that these documents have been fully considered. A copy of the partially-initialed Form PTO-1449 is attached hereto.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103:

Claims 29-30 and 41-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Venkatraman et al. (U.S. '973) in view of Marx et al. (U.S. '504). Other claims were rejected in view of the Venkatraman/Marx combination in further view of third and/or fourth references (e.g., De l'Etraz et al. and/or Kolluri et al.). Applicant traverses these rejections with respect to newly-added claims 55-62.

New independent claims 55/59 relate to a method/system for processing and searching user records for user addresses in response to a request therefor. These independent claims relate to creation of the records (see elements (a)-(c) in claims 55 and 59), as well as searching of the records thus created (see elements (d)-(f) of claims 55 and 59) for the requested information. Support for the creation of the records can be found on page 15, line 1 to page 20, line 13 of the original specification. Support for the searching of the records can be found on page 20, line 14 to page 29, line 20 of the original specification.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. The combination of Venkatraman and Marx fails to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. For example, the combination of Venkatraman and Marx fails to teach or suggest the following limitations of independent claim 55 (similar comments apply to independent claim 59):

- d) receiving a search request from a user specifying a user identifier for which the corresponding user address is required;
- e) identifying the user record of the user making the search request; and
- f) searching the stored user records using the link information to produce a list of search results corresponding to the search request, wherein the link information is iteratively used to identify further user records located up to a predetermined number of links from the user record of the user making the search request.

Venkatraman describes a billing system capable of charging for a variety of teleconference service types in a way which enables a customer to easily identify and verify the different services used by different members of the conference. The generated billing records, however, are not used for searching purposes.

Page 12 of the Office Action alleges that Venkatraman discloses identifying call records and customers in the discussion of previous (and now canceled) claim 34. However, any allegation that this alleged disclosure corresponds to the searching of the present claims is incorrect. That is, Venkatraman fails to teach or suggest elements (d)-(f) in independent claims 55 and 59. In particular, Venkatraman fails to teach or suggest the use of a user identifier to find a corresponding user address by iterative use of the link information.

Venkatraman also fails to disclose the creation of user records in the manner or using means of the type specifically required by claims 55 and 59. In particular, Venkatraman fails to disclose that the user records include link information of the type set out in element (c) of

independent claims 55 and 59. For example, the Office Action's previous analysis (see page 4 of the Office Action) alleges that the dial-in/out numbers are linkable identifiers of the record of the dial-in user. However, these do not serve to link user records as set forth in independent claims 55 and 59.

Marx describes providing alerts to parties during a call connection. However, Marx fails to resolve the above-described deficiencies of Venkatraman with respect to claims 55 and 59. In particular, Marx fails to disclose describing anything similar to the searching of records in the manner or using the means set forth in claims 55 and 59 nor the use of link information.

Moreover, one of ordinary skill in the art would have not been motivated to combine the teachings of Venkatraman with Marx. That is, one skilled in the art seeking a way to find a user address would not consider either Venkatraman nor Marx to be promising starting points since both are not directed to the searching across a number of user records which are linked in a specific manner. Moreover, Venkatraman and Marx involve quite different technical areas, and thus one of ordinary skill in the art would not have looked to combine them to allegedly arrive at the present invention.

Neither De l'Etraz nor Kolluri resolves the above-described deficiencies of the Venkatraman/Marx combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the above-noted rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

Conclusion:

Applicant believes that this entire application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests a notice to this effect. If the Examiner has any questions or believes that an interview would further prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

SHIPMAN
Appl. No. 10/532,106
June 18, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: _____



Raymond Y. Mah
Reg. No. 41,426

RYM:dmw
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100

